

### REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-6 and 11 have been amended. Claims 7-10 and 12-25 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 26-35 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-6, 11 and 26-35 are presented for examination. The following remarks are in response to the final Office Action, mailed May 25, 2007.

#### 35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-6 and 11-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Cook, et al., U.S. Patent No.6, 922,776 ("Cook").

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method comprising:  
registering a first party and a second party with a database at a server, wherein the first part is registered as a party relying on a second party's certificate;  
revoking the second party's certificate after registering the first party, wherein the revocation is performed according to a revocation policy; and  
initiating communication with the first party to indicate that the second party's certificate has been revoked, wherein the communication includes notifying the first party that the second party's certificate has been revoked, wherein the notification is further sent to other parties registering with the database as relying on the second party's certificate.

(emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the reference and the pending claims. For example, Cook discloses a "scalable system for notification of a change in condition of an electronic certificate is provided. The system includes a network of servers capable of providing notification of changes in conditions of electronic certificate to an unlimited number of users. The system includes a first server comprising a detection module and a notification module. The system having at

least one server capable of actively monitoring and detecting changes in conditions of a certificate. Other CAP servers in the system may and/or may not actively monitor electronic certificates at the same time. That is, these CAP servers may actively monitor conditions of electronic certificates at the same time they play passive roles (e.g., not monitoring the electronic certificates for which they will be notified of changes from another CAP server).” (Abstract).

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, in pertinent part, recites “initiating communication with the first party to indicate that the second party’s certificate has been revoked, wherein the communication includes notifying the first party that the second party’s certificate has been revoked, wherein the notification is further sent to other parties registering with the database as relying on the second party’s certificate”. Cook does not reach or reasonably suggest initiating communication with the first party to indicate that the second party’s certificate has been revoked, wherein the communication includes notifying the first party that the second party’s certificate has been revoked, wherein the notification is further sent to other parties registering with the database as relying on the second party’s certificate as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 its dependent claims.

Claim 11 contains limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1s its dependent claims.

#### New Claims

New claim 36 contains limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 36 and its dependent claims are distinguished over the cited reference.

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**  
**OCT 19 2007**

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 7-10 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Cook, et al., U.S. Patent No.6, 922,776 ("Cook") in view of Kaliski, Jr., U.S. Patent No.6,085,320 ("Kaliski").

Claims 7-10 and 22-25 have been cancelled without prejudice.

**Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Attorney Docket No. 42P14058  
Application No. 10/622,286

8

Attorney Docket No. 42P14058  
Application No. 10/622,286

9